

**REMARKS**

Claims 25-31, 33-36, and 38-43 are pending in this application. Claims 25, 36, and 43 are amended. Claims 32 and 37 are cancelled.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephonic interview on October 9, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner and applicant's representatives discussed applicant's techniques, proposed claim amendments, and the Balasubramaniam reference.

The Examiner has rejected claims 25-31, 33-36, and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Balasubramaniam and Platt. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant's techniques are directed to optimizing network-based applications. A network-based application (e.g., software component) may be customized for a particular execution environment of a client to optimize the user's experience. Applicant's techniques determine whether a software component can successfully execute in the execution environment of the client. For example, applicant's techniques may determine whether the client supports a certain scripting language used by the software component. In addition, applicant's techniques determine parameters of the execution environment of the client, such as plug-ins installed, any previously installed files for the application, security policies of the client, hardware configuration of the client, and other parameters. If the software component can successfully execute on the client, the client provides these parameters to the server in connection with a request to download the software component. The server downloads to the client a software component that is configured by the server according to these provided parameters. That is, the server may customize or adapt the software component based on one or more of these parameters. If, on the other hand, the software component cannot successfully execute on the client, an error message is presented to the client.

In some embodiments, applicant's techniques continue to detect parameters of the client's execution environment after the configured software component has been downloaded to the client. If a change in a parameter of the execution environment is detected, the client notifies the server of the change to the parameter, so that the server can re-configure the software component for the changed execution environment. For example, the server may adjust the configuration and settings of the software component based on the changed parameter.

Balasubramaniam describes browsing web sites using different types of browsers. A web server may serve web pages that can only be displayed on a client computer running Internet Explorer and cannot be displayed on a client computer running Netscape Navigator. If the web pages are served to a client computer running Netscape Navigator, which would not otherwise be able to display the web page, a plug-in that emulates Internet Explorer must be installed on the client computer. Balasubramaniam discloses when a request for a web page is received at a web server, first determining whether the client is using Internet Explorer. If so, the web page is served to the client. If not, the web server determines whether the plug-in is already installed on the client computer and, if not, the web server downloads the plug-in to the client computer. A user may manually download the plug-in after filling out a form on a second web page displayed by the web server, or the plug-in may be automatically downloaded to the client computer.

Claims 25-31, 33-36, and 38-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Balasubramaniam and Platt. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 25-31 and 33-35 recite "receiving from the server the software component configured according to the determined parameters [of the execution environment of the client]." Claims 36 and 38-43 recite "configuring the software component according to the determined parameters [of the execution environment of the client]." Applicant's techniques emphasize that a network-based application may be customized, adapted,

and/or tailored at a user's machine and at servers used during the application's execution to optimize the user's experience. (Specification, p. 2, ¶ 6.)

The Examiner cites Balasubramaniam at 6:47-51 as corresponding to these recited features. (Office Action, Apr. 16, 2008, p. 3, 7.) The cited portion of Balasubramaniam describes that a client computer may manually download an Internet Explorer-emulating plug-in after filling out a form displayed on a second web page, or the plug-in may be automatically downloaded to the client computer. However, one skilled in the art would not reasonably interpret that being permitted to download a plug-in in exchange for filling out a form means that the plug-in is "configured according to" the form. Balasubramaniam's plug-in is not "arrange[d] in a particular configuration" or "arrange[d] or order[ed] so as to fit it for a designated task" based on the form. (Oxford English Dictionary, definition of "configure.") Balasubramaniam sends the same plug-in to each user running Netscape Navigator; the plug-in is not "arrange[d] in a particular configuration" based on anything entered into the form by the user. Moreover, Balasubramaniam emphasizes providing "standard applications or services" to a user of a client computer," without analyzing the execution environment of the client or adjusting the application or service in regard to the execution environment. (Balasubramaniam, 4:8-14.)

In addition, Balasubramaniam's user originally requests a web page that can only be displayed on a computer running Internet Explorer. It is the Examiner's position that requesting this web page, which contains software components, corresponds to applicant's "request to launch the software component." (Office Action, Apr. 16, 2008, p. 2, 8.) If Balasubramaniam were to correspond to applicant's techniques, however, filling out the form on Balasubramaniam's second web page would result in the download of the originally requested web page and/or its contained software components. Instead, filling out the form on Balasubramaniam's second web page results in download of the Internet Explorer-emulating plug-in, which is separate from the originally requested web page and its contained software components.

Moreover, claims 25-31 and 33-35 recite that the code of the launch page sends a request to download a software component "when it is determined that the software component can successfully execute" (emphasis added). Claims 36 and 38-43 recite that the client sends a request to download a software component "after the code executing at the client determines that the software component can successfully execute" (emphasis added). In contrast to applicant's techniques, Balasubramanian's plug-in is downloaded when the originally requested web page, with its software components, cannot execute successfully.

As amended, claims 25-31 and 33-35 recite:

updating the received launch page to include code to continue to detect parameters of the execution environment of the client; and

under control of the updated launch page,

detecting changes in a parameter of the execution environment of the client; and

when a change in a parameter is detected, notifying the server of the change to the parameter so that the server can effect the re-configuring of the software component.

That is, applicant's techniques may continue to detect parameters of the client's execution environment after the configured software component has been downloaded to the client. If a change in a parameter of the execution environment is detected, the client notifies the server of the change, so that the server can re-configure the software component for the changed execution environment. Neither Balasubramanian nor Platt apparently discloses or suggests these recited features.

As amended, claims 36 and 38-43 recite "wherein the software component can successfully execute in the execution environment of the client when a certain scripting language is supported on the client." For example, content and program code for the software component may use one or more scripting languages, including Java, JavaScript, Java server pages (JSP), Perl, C/C++, active server pages (ASP), ActiveX, and/or common gateway interface (CGI). In order for the software component to

successfully execute on the client, the scripting languages used by the software component should be supported on the client. Neither Balasubramaniam nor Platt discloses determining whether a client supports a certain scripting language in order to determine whether a software component can successfully execute on the client.

As amended, claims 25-31 and 33-35 also recite "wherein each client receives the software component configured to its own parameters." As amended, claims 36 and 38-43 also recite "wherein the software component is configured to each client's own parameters." That is, different clients may receive differently configured software components, depending on the parameters of the execution environment of each client. Unlike applicant's techniques, Balasubramaniam apparently downloads the same plug-in to each client running Netscape Navigator. Balasubramaniam's Internet Explorer-emulating plug-in is not configured differently for different clients. Neither Balasubramaniam nor Platt apparently discloses or suggests these recited features.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a prompt notice of allowance.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268862US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio  
Maurice J. Pirio  
Registration No.: 33,273  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8548  
(206) 359-9000 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant